

MAY 5 1960

Approved For Release 2005/01/05 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000700200007-9

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

challenged the advocates of the committee to debate the issues rather than resort to personal abuse.

We urge you to write to Congressman ROOSEVELT congratulating him on his speech and asking for a copy. It is full of important material which should be used to urge your representatives in the House and Senate to see that the national political platforms this year rule out this vicious defamation by Congress.

Follow up with a letter to Representative CHESTER BOWLES, House Office Building, Washington, D.C. Congressman BOWLES is the chairman of the Democratic Party platform committee. He should know what you think about the menace of the House Un-American Activities Committee and the Senate Committee on Internal Security, of which Senator EASTLAND, of Mississippi, is chairman.

The Communist Party was pleased, too. The official west coast Communist Party newspaper, the People's World, gave the remarks big play in its issue of April 30. The National Guardian, which claims to be the progressive newsweekly, but is actually the most blatantly pro-Communist of any newspaper in the United States—other than the party's official publication—gave page 1 headlines and coverage to the remarks. The article was written by none other than Russ Nixon, who is a staff correspondent for this Communist mouthpiece, in addition to being a Communist labor official and lobbyist in Washington. Russ Nixon urged all National Guardian readers to write to their Congressman in support of the remarks of the gentleman from California. He also wrote of the need of the gentleman from California for support from back home.

CHAIRMAN WALTER'S POSITION

In order to support his position for abolition, the gentleman from California made grave and serious charges. He claimed, and cleverly tried to lead you to believe, that none other than the chairman of the House Committee on Un-American Activities, the Honorable FRANCIS E. WALTER, favors abolishing the work of the committee.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot pretend to speak for the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania, but, likewise, I refuse to stand by while any Member of this House is misrepresented.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania has served devotedly on the Committee on Un-American Activities since 1949. He has led the committee actively, as its chairman, since 1955. He has won the support and respect of not only all of his colleagues on the committee and other Members of this House, but of millions of American citizens throughout this Nation.

Any statement or implication to the effect that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is in favor of the curtailment or abolishment of the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities is preposterous, erroneous and unfounded. How can there be any question as to the position of the committee's chairman when, only last year on January 15, 1959, in response to the proposal by the gentleman from California to abolish the committee, Mr. WALTER made the

following statement on the floor of this House:

I waited in vain, Mr. Speaker—

Said Mr. WALTER—

to hear the gentleman from California describe how his resolution would strengthen the investigation of communism by abolishing the Committee on Un-American Activities.

Let us make no mistake about it, Mr. Speaker, the resolution of the gentleman from California is not designed to strengthen the investigation of subversion. It is designed to strangle the investigation of subversion.

Mr. WALTER continued:

I am not irrevocably wedded to any particular structural organization of a unit of the House charged with the investigation of subversion. As this House knows, I myself have recently made certain suggestions for jurisdictional changes in the present committee and from time to time I have given considerable study to possible new language relating to powers and duties of the present committee.

Mr. WALTER concluded:

I am, however, Mr. Speaker, irrevocably committed to do all in my power as a Member of this Congress and as a citizen of this Republic to resist and fight communism and to fight it with all my might.

Mr. Speaker, I may be a fool, but never could I be so foolish as to interpret this uncompromising, straightforward, unequivocal language as a proposal to curtail or eliminate the investigation of subversion, or to abolish the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities.

Quite obviously, the intent of the gentleman from Pennsylvania is to enlarge and strengthen the investigation of subversion and not to abolish it. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania favors abolition of the work of the Un-American Activities Committee, as the gentleman from California claims, why has he just challenged the proposal to abolish the committee's work, as reported in the Allentown Morning Call of April 26, 1960?

According to this newspaper, Mr. WALTER, when questioned by reporters as he was about to leave for Europe, said that he had not had a chance to read the speech of the gentleman from California, but that he would reply to it as soon as he had. He also said:

It is significant that ROOSEVELT's attack on the committee should be made just before the committee reports out a bill having to do with the employment of subversives on our ships and in the Government.

Do these sound like the words of a man who favors abolition of the committee's work?

For a number of years, I, personally, along with Chairman WALTER, have been a strong proponent of action to increase the scope of the Committee on Un-American Activities so that it might include within its jurisdiction espionage, immigration, sabotage, migratory work operations, passports, and other aspects of our Nation's life which are the targets of the insidious Communist campaign.

Like the committee's distinguished chairman, I am not wedded to any par-

ticular structural organization, nor to any special name or phraseology to describe the unit of this House charged with the investigation of subversion. Under normal circumstances, I, myself, would be very much in favor of having the House investigation of subversion fall under the domain of the Judiciary Committee, as it does in the Senate under the Subcommittee on Internal Security, provided such a move would be the basis for more effective and efficient investigation and surveillance of subversive operations.

I cannot, however, in all conscience, and would not, under a sense of realism, propose such a change in jurisdiction at this time for, as I have indicated, it is well known that the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary of this House of Representatives is one of the loudest proponents of the efforts to curtail and eliminate the work of the present Committee on Un-American Activities and is also one of the strongest supporters of the gentleman from California.

If the gentleman from California is sincerely interested in the preservation of our constitutional liberties and if he is, as he claims to be, concerned over the fact that "we are living in a hostile world in which communism poses a threat," then I suggest that he come forward with a realistic proposal in support of the gentleman from Pennsylvania—a proposal which will increase the scope of investigation of subversion—a proposal which will combat subversion on every battlefield—a proposal devoid of pussy-footing, sterility, and compromise, which will enable this House to inform itself completely on every aspect of Communist subversion and thus lay a basis for more effective legislation to control and eliminate espionage, infiltration, treason, and other aspects of Communist operations which are plaguing this Nation at this very instant.

... A SPENDER ADVOCATES ECONOMY

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California criticizes and bemoans the fact that this year and last year the Congress appropriated \$327,000 for the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities. He says that he cannot find "any rational correlation" between the fact that it should receive this amount of money at the present time when Communist Party membership, he states, is "fewer than 10,000," and the fact that the committee received an appropriation of only \$50,000 in 1945 when the party had approximately 64,000 members.

With what he obviously believes to be my very limited mental ability, I will try to demonstrate some rational correlation between these figures.

First, in recent years, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has received larger and larger appropriations for its work in combating the operations of the Communist conspiracy in spite of the fact that party membership has declined considerably below the 1945 level. The reason for this is very simple. As J. Edgar Hoover has testified repeatedly before the Appropriations Committee of

this House, the FBI's task of keeping track of Communist Party agents and activities has become increasingly difficult as the party has gone deeper underground and adopted more elusive tactics. Basically, the task of the House committee is the same. Every member of our committee—and everyone who knows anything about communism—is cognizant of the fact that it is much more difficult today for the committee to develop information, for legislative purposes, about the Communists and their operations. It is more difficult, more time-consuming, and more costly than it was in 1945, not because of the ineffectiveness of the Communist Party but, rather, because of its willingness and ability to operate effectively despite greater obstacles.

A second reason is that the Congress and the American people today, largely because of the work of the Committee on Un-American Activities, are much more cognizant of the need for continuing investigation and surveillance of Moscow's treasonous fifth column. Because of this, there are larger appropriations for the committee and the FBI, with the obvious approval of the people and the Congress. They see the need for more money being spent on this problem, even though the gentleman from California cannot comprehend this.

Third, as the chairman pointed out in the foreword of the committee's annual report for 1959 and in a recent nationwide radio broadcast on the Dean Manion Forum, the United States is now spending over \$40 billion annually for military defense alone, to protect this country against the external threat of communism. The cost of individual weapons has reached fantastic heights. A nuclear submarine costs \$49 million, an attack carrier \$280 million, a single Titan missile \$2 million, and each now outmoded F-104 Starfighter interceptor cost almost \$1½ million.

I have previously pointed out on this floor that it is today the consensus of opinion of many outstanding authorities that although we must be completely prepared at all times to fight a major war, it is also true that something in the nature of a military stalemate exists between this country and the Soviet Union. This stalemate has forced the Kremlin to change its tactics, placing greater emphasis on nonmilitary conquest, devoting much more of its time, energy, and money to internal wrecking and subversion in order to seize control of its yet unconquered lands. J. Edgar Hoover said in a speech in Chicago just a few weeks ago:

The war between communism and the free world is not fought with bombs or other tangible weapons. It is being fought now by subversion.

Every recent defector from the Soviet secret police has stated that the United States is the No. 1 target of Moscow.

The significance of these facts is obvious. Communist efforts to destroy this country from within by nonmilitary means have been increased, and will continue to increase steadily, and adequate countermeasures must be taken to defeat them. Why, I ask, does the

gentleman from California object to the House appropriating \$327,000 a year—a tiny fraction of the cost of any single major weapon in our military arsenal—to the one and only effort this Congress makes directly to prevent Communist conquest of this Nation from within? Does he know that in the last 3 years the Emergency Civil Liberties Committee—just one Communist front—has spent over \$100,000 and has used a large part of this sum to destroy the Committee on Un-American Activities?

Does he know that, as this committee has revealed, some 10 million pieces of Communist propaganda are flooding into this country from abroad every year? Does he object to spending relatively small sums of money to meet these and many other internal security problems and find an answer to them? Why does he want to abolish the only committee established by this House to investigate and recommend legislation to cope with them?

I have no intention of belittling in the least the work of any other committee of this House, but I must question the claim of the gentleman from California that the work of some of the other committees which have received smaller appropriations is "by any objective standards more important than the work of the House Committee on Un-American Activities." I, for one, cannot think of anything that is more important than preserving this Nation from the fate that has befallen some others which have been brought into the Soviet orbit by internal subversion and nonmilitary means. Cuba, at our very doorstep, is only the latest of a long list of nations which have suffered this fate.

HOUSE COMMITTEE'S FRIENDS ARE LEGION

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California claims that he could "recite the huge list of impeccable leaders and organizations" that agree with his view of the committee. He said that among them were "a great number of the country's leading newspapers." Let me say that we all have our own view of what are the leading newspapers in the country and that my views on this subject vary considerably from those of the gentleman from California. It is obvious to every Member of this House, I believe, that no matter what position you take on any subject, you can find some editorial writers for some newspapers who share your views.

I, too, could name many newspapers which, over the years, have strongly endorsed the committee and its work. I do not intend to take the time to insert editorial after editorial in the record here. This much, however, I do want to say:

During the past 4 years alone the following distinguished Americans have shown their wholehearted support of the committee and its work by appearing voluntarily as witnesses before the committee, by serving as consultants for the committee, and by contributing written material for committee publications. There is one thing that distinguishes each and every one of these people from the critics the gentleman from California quoted in his remarks last week.

Each and every one of these persons is recognized as an authority on one phase or another of Communism and the Soviet Union.

Among the clergymen who have so assisted the committee, there are Dr. Daniel A. Poling, editor of the Christian Herald, which has the largest circulation of any nondenominational Protestant publication in the country; the well-known Roman Catholic Bishop Fulton J. Sheen; Rabbi S. Andhil Fineberg, community-relations consultant of the American Jewish Committee; Dr. Charles W. Lowry, director of the Foundation for Religious Action in the Social and Civil Order and author of "Communism and Christ"; and the Rev. John F. Cronin of the National Catholic Welfare Conference.

Labor leaders who have given their active cooperation to the committee include George Meany, president of the AFL-CIO; Albert J. Hayes, president of the International Association of Machinists; the late Harry Lundeberg, president of the Seafarers' International Union; Matthew Woll, vice president of the AFL-CIO; Richard L. G. Deverall of the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions; and Serafino Romualdi, Latin-American representative of the AFL-CIO.

A few of the many prominent educators who have contributed to the committee's work in the last 4 years alone are Robert Strausz-Hupe, director of the Foreign Policy Research Institute at the University of Pennsylvania; Dr. Gerhart Niemeyer, professor of political science at the University of Notre Dame; William C. McGovern of Northwestern University; Dr. Stefan T. Possony, Georgetown University; Dr. Richard L. Walker of the University of South Carolina; and Dr. Karl A. Wittfogel of the University of Washington.

Among the top military leaders of this country have been Generals Maxwell D. Taylor, Nathan F. Twining, Alfred M. Gruenther, Matthew B. Ridgway, Mark Clark, Albert C. Wedemeyer, Curtis E. LeMay, Charles A. Willoughby, James H. Doolittle, and the late Gen. Claire Lee Chennault. Among the admirals are Arleigh A. Burke, Louis E. Denfield, Robert B. Carney, Charles Turner Joy, and Charles M. Cooke.

More than 20 well-known authors of books on communism have similarly cooperated with the committee. Among them David Dallin, Max Eastman, Henry A. Kissinger, John C. Caldwell, Whitaker Chambers, and James Burnham.

Among the dozen or more journalists have been William Randolph Hearst, Jr., William Philip Simms, Eligene Lyons, Constantine Brown, Ludwell Denny, Willard Edwards, and Ralph de Toledano.

Not only Americans, but top-ranking leaders and former leaders of other nations, many of which, I regret to say, are now under Communist slavery, have also demonstrated their feelings about the committee by active cooperation with it. Among these are August Rei, former President and prime minister of the Estonian Republic; Stanislaw Mikolajczyk, former prime minister of the Polish

1960

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

8969

Government in Exile; Ferenc Nagy, former foreign minister of Hungary; Carlos P. Romulo, Philippine ambassador to the U.N. and former President of the Philippine Republic; Msgr. Bela Varga, president of the Hungarian National Council; Joseph Lipski, former Polish ambassador to Germany; and Dr. Chiu-Yuan Hu, advisor to the Chinese Mission to the U.N. General Assembly.

The Committee on Un-American Activities has also won the support of a large number of organizations which are truly representative of all phases of American life. Among them are the American Bar Association's Committee to Study Communist Tactics, Strategy and Objectives; the All-American Conference to Combat Communism, which represents over 50 nationwide civic, fraternal, religious, veterans', women's, and nationality groups and organizations; the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, Catholic War Veterans, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Motion Picture Alliance, Daughters of the American Revolution, American Coalition of Patriotic Societies, and numerous other organizations, including church groups and union locals.

Just about a month and a half ago, Francis Cardinal Spellman, in a telegram to Representative Jackson of the Committee, made the following statement:

I respect the fact that Congressman WALTER, you and other members of your committee have rendered outstanding service in exposing Communist activities.

In August 1955, Bernard Baruch, distinguished elder statesman and advisor to Presidents, said to the committee chairman, Mr. WALTER:

You have a tough task to do and are doing it well. I have great respect for this committee.

In November 1957, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover, who certainly knows more about Communist activities within this Nation than any other American and is in the best position to judge the effectiveness of individuals and organizations fighting communism, made the following statement to the chairman of the Committee on Un-American Activities:

Your committee's role in safeguarding our freedoms is well known to every patriotic citizen, and real Americans are not going to be fooled or misled by efforts to discredit your vital task.

I submit that no matter how hard he tried and how much time he devoted to the task, the gentleman from California could never come up with so distinguished a list of persons who share his view of the committee, a view he has expressed in such defamatory language. I do concede, however, that he could, as I have pointed out, list many Communist and pro-Communist organizations which have hurled similar epithets at the committee.

The gentleman from California conceded in his remarks that there was a view of the committee other than his, "namely its own"—an implication that the committee stood alone in defense of its work. The facts and names I have just cited prove how entirely wrong this implication was.

Before going on to the next topic, I want to make just one more comment about these famous Americans and foreign fighters for freedom whose names I have mentioned. These are the people the gentleman from California mockingly referred to in his speech as "professional dragon slayers" or reformed "dragons" used by the committee.

WHAT THE COMMITTEE HAS REALLY DONE

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California claimed that he would demonstrate his remarks that when the House Committee on Un-American Activities was not being "harmful" or "bumptious," it was "just plain silly." This could be proved, he added, merely by a consideration of its operations last year. But let us see how much consideration he gave to last year's committee operations.

One, he gave a distorted summary of the first chapter of the committee's annual report for 1959 and then made the following statement:

Frankly, this sort of work reflects a monumental silliness. If it were the entire story, we should end the committee's existence on the grounds of uselessness alone. It is little better than insulting to the intelligence of this House and this country to maintain a committee for the purpose of investigating and reporting what everyone already knows.

Two, he dismissed the committee's investigation of Communist infiltration in the meatpacking industry in the following words:

Now, personally, I am willing to eat meat even though packed by political heretics.

Three, he made some references to the hearing in which Secretary Sharp appeared before the committee. Beyond that, he did not mention another thing done by the committee in all of last year, except its preparatory work for hearings on the subject of Communist infiltration in the schools of California. This subject I will deal with at a later point in my remarks.

I would like to bring to your attention some of the committee's operations last year which the gentleman from California did not even mention, apparently because he had classified it as "monumental silliness."

There was the committee report, "Patterns of Communist Espionage," which received widespread favorable reception and is now being used by the U.S. State Department in the training of its overseas personnel, by the Military Assistance Institute which trains our country's military attachés who are to be stationed in our embassies and diplomatic establishments abroad, and which has also been purchased in quantity from the Government Printing Office by the British and West German Governments.

There was not a word in his remarks about the testimony of Petr Deriabin, a former member of the Soviet secret police, on the size and operations of Soviet intelligence agencies.

He did not say a word about the hearings the committee held in his own State which revealed that the Communist Party there has undergone a complete reorganization and has undertaken a new, aggressive plan of operation.

Why did he not say a word about the committee's hearings in Pittsburgh which

revealed Communist infiltration in our basic defense industries, and the fact that Communist-controlled unions represent the workers in a number of key plants which have contracts with the Department of Defense?

I do not want to go into detail, but will mention some of the other activities of the committee during the year 1959 which the gentleman from California says were "harmful," "bumptious," or "just plain silly."

Its revelation of the shocking number of artists with extensive Communist affiliations who were represented in the American National Exhibition in Moscow—a revelation which brought at least partial corrective action by the President of the United States.

The committee hearings which showed extensive use and abuse of U.S. passports by identified Communists who have traveled abroad to help the Kremlin undermine the United States and destroy the freedom of additional nations.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from California said nothing about the committee's hearings on the training operations of the U.S. Communist Party, about its reports on Communist infiltration of the legal profession, on Communist lobbying operations in the Nation's Capital, and the Communist parcel operation which adds millions of dollars each year, taken from the pockets of American taxpayers, to the treasuries of the Soviet Union and its satellites.

He overlooked completely the first volume of "Facts on Communism," a work dealing with the Communist ideology which has been hailed by many scholars.

Not only did the gentleman from California fail to mention any of these activities, but he did not give a true picture of the four activities he did mention.

I have already referred to the manner in which he lightly dismissed the committee's hearings on the meatpacking industry and, by implication, in any basic industry. In discussing the hearing on the Air Force manual with Secretary Sharp, the gentleman from California made two charges against the committee which he said were "basic."

First, he charged that the committee had no jurisdiction to question Secretary Sharp on the withdrawal of the manual. This is not so. When the manual was withdrawn, it was done in such a manner that the public and the press throughout the country were given the impression that it was withdrawn because the information contained in it was not true. The manual quoted a publication of the committee and many people were led to believe that the validity of the statements made in this publication was open to question. I want to emphasize the point that this publication contained the testimony of five Protestant church leaders from China and Korea on Communist persecution of religion in North Korea and Red China. The committee was certainly justified in questioning Secretary Sharp on the matter of whether or not the Air Force had found this testimony questionable. When Secretary Sharp appeared before the committee, he admitted that in withdrawing the manual the Air Force had not made

it clear that it was not questioning the validity of this testimony and that this was "unfortunate."

Secondly, the gentleman from California charged that the committee tried to get the Secretary of the Air Force to reconsider his withdrawal of the manual. I challenge the gentleman from California to read the record of the hearing and find a single word that will give any credence at all to this charge. No member of the committee made any such attempt.

Chapter 1 of the committee's 1959 annual report was an analysis of the status of the U.S. Communist Party as of the year's end. It gave factual information on party tactics and strategy, on its 17th convention, and also dissected the major propaganda slogans now being used by Communists, both here and abroad. He described this chapter as justification for ending the committee's existence on the grounds of "uselessness."

It is difficult for me to comprehend how any Member of this House would describe such information as useless. Every person of intelligence knows that the Communist subversive drive can be stopped only in the Congress and the people know the strategy and tactics the party is using at any given period and if they are informed about the truths the Communists try to conceal by deceptive propaganda techniques.

The gentleman from California also claimed that it was insulting to the intelligence of this House to maintain a committee for the purpose of investigating and reporting "what everyone already knows." I challenge the statement that the information contained in this report is merely what everyone already knows. I also suggest that if it is and we are to follow my colleague's logic, there is also justification for abolishing the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency.

I urge the Members of this House to compare the first chapters of this committee's 1958 and 1959 annual reports with the testimony of J. Edgar Hoover before the appropriations subcommittees in those years and also with some of the public addresses and statements made by CIA Director Allen Dulles and other top officials of that organization during the same period. They will discover that if the statement of the gentleman from California that the committee merely reports what everyone already knows is true, then it is also true of what Mr. Hoover and Mr. Dulles report. According to the claims of the gentleman from California, these two agencies should also have their existence ended on the grounds of uselessness insofar as any information they give the public is concerned.

THE THREAT FROM WITHIN

The gentleman from California conceded that "we are living in a hostile world in which communism poses a threat," but at the same time went on to minimize that threat. He stated that the Communist Party "has gone down to its lowest point in history." Actually, that information is not correct. The party reached its lowest point 8 1/2 years

ago and has since been gaining in strength. In various parts of his remarks, he airily referred to the Communists as mere "heretics," "so-called un-American persons," "what the committee calls malevolent conspirators," and humorously as "dragons."

He described the Communist Party as being merely the "ranks of bitterness and extremism." He said that he was not, and that we should not, be afraid of Communists in the meatpacking industry, among the clergy, or in the automotive manufacturing field. At no place in his speech did he concede that Communist operations in this country were a real or dangerous threat. By the light and mocking manner in which he spoke of the committee and its work, he distorted and seriously underrated the true nature of the problem with which we are dealing. He bled for the so-called "victims" of the committee who might lose jobs in a basic industry after being exposed as Communists. At no place in his remarks did he admit the possibility that these people might be malevolent and treasonous conspirators against their own country.

Just a short while before the gentleman from California made his speech, FBI Director J. Edgar Hoover testified before the House Appropriations Committee. On February 8 of this year, in his testimony before that group, he issued a strong, clear-cut warning against judging the danger of the Communist Party merely by its numbers or of underestimating the internal Communist threat. He said:

To minimize the menace of communism in the United States as the activity of a small dissident group develops lethargy and can only lead to disaster.

Mr. Hoover mentioned the fact that at the present time the FBI has 160 organizations in the United States under investigation as suspected or known Communist-front or Communist-infiltrated groups.

To demonstrate one aspect of the danger of communism, he cited certain facts about recent Communist success in the home State of the gentleman who now urges that the Committee on Un-American Activities be abolished. Again I quote the Director of the FBI:

Those who doubt that Communists could be placed in responsible government positions under our democratic system of government in this country, thus greatly extending their influence and power, should ponder some election results. Holland DeWitt Roberts, in 1953, was described by the California Senate fact-finding committee on un-American activities as one of the most highly placed, active, and devoted servants of the Communist cause in northern California. In December 1956, before the House Committee on Un-American Activities he invoked the fifth amendment to questions regarding his Communist Party membership. In spite of this background he received over 400,000 votes in the California primary election in June of 1958 as a candidate on an independent ticket for State superintendent of public instruction.

A more recent example concerns Archie Brown, a longtime Communist leader, who has been identified with the Communist movement in the San Francisco, Calif., area for more than a quarter of a century. He

was a candidate for the San Francisco Board of Supervisors during the municipal election in San Francisco last November.

In spite of the fact that Brown's association with the Communist Party was widely publicized during the campaign, he received some 33,000 votes, slightly more than 13 percent of the votes cast, finishing 10th in a field of 14 candidates running for six seats on the board of supervisors.

It seems strange to me that, after Mr. Hoover's warning on these matters had been given to Members of this House, the gentleman from California should urge the abolition of the only committee charged with the duty of combating Communist subversion, referring to its members with amusement as "dragon slayers," and stating that if he had an opportunity to do so he would have voted against any appropriation for the committee.

In view of the obvious gains the Communist conspiracy is making in the State of California, I cannot help thinking that our colleague from that State would do well to devote time and energy to alerting his constituents to its evils instead of trying to eliminate its opponents.

KEEP THE RECORD STRAIGHT

Mr. Speaker, when our colleague from California asked that we debate the worth of the committee, I thought that the material he would present against it would at least be factual and therefore debatable. As I have previously shown, our colleague dealt with vindication, not facts. This can be further documented by examining many of the charges contained in his speech of April 25. I shall take two of these statements to show that facts do not seem to be too important to our colleague.

The gentleman from California centered his attack on the members of the committee around the hearings they had scheduled last year on Communist infiltration in California schools. He described the committee's conduct in connection with these scheduled hearings as the "most shameful episode in the history of this House." To support this characterization, our colleague advised the members of this House, and I quote:

The committee had subpoenaed 113 public school teachers in early June 1959. Most of the subpoenas were served on the teachers at school at 9 o'clock in the morning on June 5.

Mr. ROOSEVELT continued:

No good reason has been advanced as to why the teachers could not have been served at home. Naturally, school administrators and fellow-teachers, as well as the children in their own classes, were at once put on notice that the teachers were, in some fashion, suspect.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the files of these subpoenaed teachers examined. These files contain not only the general instructions which were given to the many agencies which assisted the committee in serving the subpoenas, but also contain a copy of each subpoena and the return executed by the individual serving the subpoena. This examination revealed that the agencies serving the subpoenas were instructed by the committee to serve them at 7:30 a.m., at the residence of each teacher.